



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,908	01/23/2004	Jason M. Benz	BUR920030121US1	1907
29154	7590	07/10/2007		
FREDERICK W. GIBB, III			EXAMINER	
Gibb & Rahman, LLC			RUGGLES, JOHN S	
2568-A RIVA ROAD				
SUITE 304			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401			1756	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/707,908	BENZ, JASON M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Ruggles	1756	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: none.
Claim(s) objected to: 8, 10-12 and 25.
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-5, 8, 10-12, 15, 17, 18 and 21-26.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment will not be entered, because: (1) it is non-responsive to the previous 4/20/07 final rejection (A) of claims 1, 3-5, 15, 17-18, 24, and 26 under 35 USC 103 over Dao et al. and Schroeder et al. (as set forth on pages 4-7 of this final rejection), (B) of claim 22 under 35 USC 103 over Dao et al., Schroeder et al., and Tzu et al. in view of either Levenson, Rolfson, or Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA), and further in view of Sandstrom (as set forth on pages 11-12 of this final rejection); and (2) it does not place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the proposed amendment has not been entered, since it is non-responsive and does not place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal, as indicated above.


Applicant's currently proposed arguments against the previous 4/20/07 FINAL rejection are still not persuasive. In particular, (A) on page 8 in response to the 4/20/07 new matter rejection under the 1st paragraph of 35 USC 112, Applicant relies on the removal of additional opaque material 112 in the second region 116 shown by Figure 5B for supporting the attack of the substrate 110 during the additional patterning step as recited in claims 21-23, but Applicant still fails to show any original support for actual "attack" of the substrate 110 during this additional patterning step that really only removes additional opaque material 112 in the second region 116.

(B) on pages 9-22 of the currently proposed response, Applicant is clearly mistaken and proposes to advance misdirected arguments against specific grounds of rejection and combinations of references that were NOT relied upon in the remaining 35 USC 103 rejections of the 4/20/07 FINAL Office action. Applicant is referred back to the previous 6/22/07 Advisory Action under item 11 (B) for an exemplary listing of rejections being argued by Applicant that were NOT even relied upon in the 4/20/07 FINAL. In fact, it is noted that at least claims 6, 13, and 19 were each previously canceled at the time of the final rejection, so these claims were certainly not rejected over the prior art therein.

It is not understood why Applicant has now failed THREE times to carefully review the specific prior art rejections actually set forth in the outstanding FINAL Office action mailed on 4/20/07. Therefore, the currently proposed 6/27/07 arguments are yet again NOT found to be credible and are clearly still non-responsive to the outstanding FINAL Office action.

Applicant is reminded that NO new time period is given for correcting the non-responsive 6/27/07 currently proposed AFTER final amendment. Therefore, the period for reply expires 7/20/07 (3 months from the mailing date of the outstanding final rejection).

jsr
571-272-1390



MARK F. HUFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700